

1 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600
2 Las Vegas, NV 89169-5996
3 Facsimile (702) 949-8321
4 Telephone (702) 949-8320

5 Robert M. Charles, Jr. NV State Bar No. 006593
6 Email: rcharles@lrlaw.com
7 John Hinderaker AZ State Bar No. 018024
8 Email: jhinderaker@lrlaw.com
9 Marvin Ruth NV State Bar No. 10979
10 Email: mruth@lrlaw.com

11 Attorneys for USACM Liquidating Trust

12 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**
13 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

14 In re:

15 **USA COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE**
16 **COMPANY,**

17 Debtor.

18 Case No. BK-S-06-10725-LBR

19 **CHAPTER 11**

20 **USACM TRUST'S MOTION TO**
21 **ALLOW PROOFS OF CLAIM**
22 **BASED UPON INVESTMENT IN**
23 **THE AMESBURY HATTERS POINT**
24 **LOAN**

25 **Date of Hearing: September 30, 2011**

26 **Time of Hearing: 9:30 a.m.**

Estimated Time for hearing: 10 min.

17 The USACM Liquidating Trust (the “USACM Trust”) moves this Court, pursuant
18 to § 502 of title 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code (the “Bankruptcy Code”) and
19 Rule 3007 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the “Bankruptcy Rules”), for an
20 order allowing the Proofs of Claim listed in **Exhibit A.** to the extent those claims are
21 based upon an investment in Amesbury Hatters Point. These claims were filed by
22 investors (“Direct Lenders”) against USA Commercial Mortgage Company (“USACM”)
23 based upon an investment in a loan (the “Amesbury Loan”) to Amesburyport Corporation
24 (the “Borrower”). This Motion is supported by the Court’s record and the Declarations of
25 Geoffrey L. Berman and Edward M. Burr in Support of USACM Trust’s Motion to Allow
26

1 Proofs of Claim Based Upon the Investment in the Amesbury Loan. (the “Berman Decl.”
2 and “Burr Decl.”).

3 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

4 **I. BACKGROUND FACTS**

5 **a. The USACM Bankruptcy**

6 On April 13, 2006 (“Petition Date”), USACM filed a voluntary petition for relief
7 under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. Debtor continued to operate its business as
8 debtor-in-possession pursuant to sections 1107(a) and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code.
9 Debtor’s post-petition management of the Debtor was under the direction of Thomas J.
10 Allison of Mesirow Financial Interim Management, LLC, who served as the Chief
11 Restructuring Officer.

12 USACM was a Nevada corporation that, prior to the Petition Date, was in the
13 business of underwriting, originating, brokering, funding and servicing commercial loans
14 primarily secured by real estate, both on behalf of investors and for its own account. That
15 business included the solicitation of investors to purchase fractional interest in loans that
16 USACM originated and then serviced. These investors are referred to as “Direct Lenders”
17 in USACM’s bankruptcy case and in this Motion.

18 On January 8, 2007, this Court entered its Order Confirming the “Debtors’ Third
19 Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization” as Modified Herein [Docket No.
20 2376]. As part of the Plan, and pursuant to an Asset Purchase Agreement filed with this
21 Court, USACM sold the servicing rights to most of the loans it serviced to Compass
22 Partners, LLC and Compass Financial Partners, LLC (“Compass”), including the
23 Amesbury Loan. The sale to Compass closed on February 16, 2007.

24 The USACM Trust exists as of the Effective Date of the Plan, which was March 12,
25 2007. Geoffrey L. Berman is the Trustee. Under the Plan, the USACM Trust is the
26

1 successor to USACM with respect to standing to seek allowance and disallowance of
2 Claims under 11 U.S.C. § 502(a).

3 Upon information derived from filings in the United States District Court, District
4 of Nevada, *3685 San Fernando Lenders Company, LLC, et al v. Compass USA SPE, LLC,*
5 *et al*, No. 2:07-cv-00892-RCJ-GWF action, the Trust believes that “Silar Advisors, LP
6 (“Silar”) financed Compass’ acquisition of the Purchased Assets, including the loan
7 service agreements in the USACM bankruptcy case and took a secured interest in those
8 Purchased Assets by executing a Master Repurchase Agreement (“Repurchase
9 Agreement”) with Compass, and by filing a UCC-1 financing statement with the State of
10 Delaware.” *Id.* Docket 1250 at 13-14 (citations to declarations omitted).

11 Further, from filings in the same action, the Trust believes that “Effective as of
12 September 26, 2007, Silar foreclosed on Compass through Asset Resolution LLC (“Asset
13 Resolution”) and took ownership of the Purchased Assets. ... Silar created Asset
14 Resolution as a ‘single purpose entity,’ conveyed all of its interests in the Repurchase
15 Agreement to Asset Resolution, and Asset Resolution properly foreclosed on the assets of
16 Compass, including the Purchased Assets.” (Citations omitted.) Asset Resolution LLC is
17 now a debtor in a chapter 7 bankruptcy case pending in Nevada, case no. BK-S-09-32824-
18 RCJ, along with certain affiliates.¹ William A. Leonard, Jr. was appointed trustee in the
19 Asset Resolution case. By Order entered on July 19, 2010 by the Hon. Robert C. Jones in
20 the Asset Resolution Case, the servicing rights for 19 loans, including the Amesbury Loan,
21 were transferred to Cross, FLS.

22 The Trust has attempted to monitor loan collections through monitoring the district
23 court litigation and the Asset Resolution bankruptcy case, but has received limited
24

25 ¹ 10 90 SPE LLC, Fiesta Stoneridge LLC, CFP Gramercy SPE LLC, Bundy 2.5 Million SPE LLC, CFP
26 Amesbury Toltec SPE LLC, Bundy Five Million LLC, Fox Hills SPE LLC, HFAH Monaco SPE LLC,
Huntsville SPE LLC, Lake Helen Partners SPE LLC, Ocean Atlantic SPE LLC, CFP, Gess SPE LLC, CFP
Brookmere Matteson SPE LLC, and Shamrock SPE LLC.

1 information concerning servicing and resolution of direct loans by Compass/Silar/Asset
2 Resolution or their successors, including the trustee in bankruptcy for Asset Resolution.
3 The Trust has also been in contact with Cross, FLS regarding the Amesbury Loan. The
4 following is the extent of the USACM Trust's information on the current servicing and
5 status of the Amesbury Loan.

6 **b. The Amesbury Loan**

7 USACM circulated an Offer Sheet to prospective Direct Lenders soliciting funding
8 for an acquisition and development loan to a borrower identified as "Amesburyport
9 Corporation." A copy of the Offer Sheet is attached hereto as **Exhibit B** and incorporated
10 by this reference. (Berman Decl., ¶ 4.) The total loan amount proposed was \$21,750,000.
11 *Id.* The Offer Sheet described the investment as a "First Trust Deed Investment" and
12 noted that the investment would be secured by a "First Mortgage on buildings 1 through 9
13 at 'Hatter' Point' in Amesbury, Massachusetts." *Id.* The Offer Sheet stated that the loan
14 proceeds would be used to "refinance the existing construction loan and provide
15 construction funds to complete the balance of the project," which was described as the
16 restoration of 9 historic brick mill buildings for conversion in to condominiums. *Id.* The
17 Offer Sheet stated that the loan-to-value was approximately 75% based on "revolver
18 fundings of \$15 million to reach an appraised 'aggregate retail sell-out' of \$48,900,000"
19 pursuant to a August 15, 2002 appraisal from Joseph J. Blake and Associates. *Id.*

20 On December 18, 2002, Borrower made and delivered to various lenders, including
21 the Direct Lenders identified in **Exhibit A**, a "Promissory Note (Refinancing and
22 Construction Loan)" (the "Note") and a Loan Agreement. (Berman Decl., ¶5.) The Loan
23 Agreement provided for a loan of up to \$21,750,000. *Id.* Pursuant to the Loan
24 Agreement, the loan amount was intended for the "refinancing of certain existing debt of
25 the Borrower, and for financing the construction of the Project." *Id.* The Loan
26

1 Agreement also provided for a \$5,000,000 “construction revolver” whereby the Borrower
2 could borrower, repay, and then re-borrow \$5,000,000 of the loan.

3 The Note was secured by a “Construction Mortgage and Security Agreement” (the
4 “Mortgage”) from Borrower in favor of the Direct Lenders, which was recorded in the
5 official records of the Essex County South District Registry on December 18, 2002 at
6 Instrument 2002121800924. (Berman Decl., ¶ 6.) The Note was also supported by a
7 Guaranty signed by William H. Sullivan on December 18, 2002. (Berman Decl., ¶ 7.)

8 The USACM “Loan Summary” dated July 31, 2006 and filed in this case shows
9 that Borrower was “Non-Performing” on the Note as of July 31, 2006. (Berman Decl., ¶
10 8.) During this bankruptcy case through the transfer of servicing to Compass, USACM
11 treated the Direct Lenders with respect to any interim payments by the borrower in
12 accordance with this Court’s orders and the confirmed Plan.

13 Counsel for the Trustee had a brief conversation with a representative of Cross,
14 FLS regarding the status of the Amesbury Loan. According to Cross, FLS, numerous
15 condominium units were completed and sold after USACM provided a partial release.
16 However, the Trust has seen evidence that the funds received from the sale of the units
17 were either not provided to USACM or USACM diverted them back to the Borrower. The
18 result was that those sale proceeds were not used to pay down the Amesbury Loan,
19 although the collateral for the loan was released by USACM. The Guarantor has now
20 passed away. A brief review of the public record shows that numerous partial releases
21 were granted to USACM. Cross is no longer going to service this loan because it
22 considers there to be no chance of recovery.

23 **c. The Amesbury Claims**

24 **Exhibit A**, attached, lists Proofs of Claim filed by Direct Lenders that appear to be
25 based in whole or in part upon an investment in the Amesbury Loan. (Burr Decl. ¶ 7.)
26 **Exhibit A** identifies the Proof of Claim number, the claimant, the claimant’s address, the

1 total amount of the claim and the total amount of the claim that appears to be related to an
2 investment in the Amesbury Loan based upon the information provided by the claimant.
3 (Burr Declaration ¶ 7.) The claims listed in **Exhibit A** are referred to hereafter as the
4 “Amesbury Claims.”

5 **II. JURISDICTION**

6 The Court has jurisdiction over this Motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1334 and 157.
7 Venue is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409. This matter is a core
8 proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 502.

9 The statutory predicates for the relief requested herein are 11 U.S.C. § 502 and
10 Bankruptcy Rule 3007.

11 **III. APPLICABLE AUTHORITY**

12 Under the Bankruptcy Code, any Claim for which a proof of claim has been filed
13 will be allowed unless a party in interest objects. If a party in interest objects to the proof
14 of claim, the Court, after notice and hearing, shall determine the amount of the Claim and
15 shall allow the Claim except to the extent that the Claim is “unenforceable against the
16 debtor . . . under any . . . applicable law for a reason other than because such claim is
17 contingent or unmatured.” 11 U.S.C. § 502(b). A properly filed proof of claim is
18 presumed valid under Bankruptcy Rule 3001(f). However, once an objection to the proof
19 of claim controverts the presumption, the creditor ultimately bears the burden of
20 persuasion as to the validity and amount of the claim. *See Ashford v. Consolidated*
21 *Pioneer Mortg. (In re Consolidated Pioneer Mortg.)*, 178 B.R. 222, 226 (9th Cir. B.A.P.
22 1995), *aff'd*, 91 F.3d 151 (9th Cir. 1996).

23 **IV. THE MOTION TO ALLOW**

24 The Direct Lenders received the first position interest in the collateral securing the
25 loan as promised by the Offer Sheet. In addition, the Direct Lenders took a known risk by
26

1 investing in a promissory note secured by a lien on real property. USACM is not liable for
2 the Borrower's default or any decrease in the value of the collateral.

3 Nonetheless, the Trust believes USACM failed to fulfill its duties as a servicer to
4 the Direct Lenders in this loan. USACM apparently granted partial releases of numerous
5 individual condominium units without receiving consideration in return for the release or,
6 possibly allowing the Borrower to retain the proceeds thereby denying the direct lenders
7 their share of those proceeds. Thus, USACM released the collateral supporting the direct
8 lender investments and securing the Amesbury Loan, without receiving anything of value
9 in return. It appears that the direct lenders who invested in the Amesbury Claim have
10 suffered a total loss that was caused, at least in large part, by USACM's misdeeds.

11 **V. CONCLUSION**

12 The USACM Trust respectfully requests that the Court allow as general unsecured
13 claims the claims against USACM listed in **Exhibit A** to the extent those claims are based
14 upon an investment in the Amesbury Loan. The USACM Trust also requests such other
15 and further relief as is just and proper.

16 Dated: August 11, 2011.

17 LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

18 By s/ John Hinderaker (AZ 18024)
19 Robert M. Charles, Jr., NV 6593
John Hinderaker, AZ 18024 (*pro hac vice*)
Marvin Ruth, NV 10979
20 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
E-mail: JHinderaker@lrlaw.com
21 *Attorneys for the USACM Liquidating Trust*

22 Copy of the foregoing and pertinent
portion of Exhibits mailed by first
class postage prepaid U.S. Mail on
23 August 11, 2011 to all parties listed on
Exhibit A attached.

24 LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

25 s/ Matt Burns

26 Matt Burns, Paralegal